

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated March 22, 2005 Examiner notes that claims 2-3, 14-18, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Please note that in view of the arguments set forth below, Applicant submits that such claims are allowable as originally drafted.

**Drawing Objections**

The drawings currently stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention as claimed (specifically, every feature of claim 6). Applicant respectfully point out that each claimed feature is depicted in the drawings. Referring to figure 1, figure 2, figure 3A, and figure 3B each claimed feature is depicted. For example, a first primary conductor (11+), first auxiliary conductor (12+), a first non-inverting amplification component (310), a ground conductor (13), a second primary conductor (11-), a second auxiliary conductor (12-), and a second non-inverting amplification component (311) are each shown.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

Claims 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2) as it is not clear how “a transmission line comprises a inverting/non-inverting amplification.” In response, Applicant has amended claims 6-8 to more accurately and precisely define the invention. The claims have been amended only for the purpose of complying with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and not for the purpose of narrowing their scope in the face of prior art. No new matter has been entered.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

Claims 1, 12, 13, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,754,244 issued to Pavio (“Pavio”). Applicant respectfully submits that such rejection is not proper as Pavio does not teach every element of Applicant’s claimed invention. “Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added).

Claim 1 requires “a first auxiliary conductor inductively coupled to a first primary conductor.” Pavo does not disclose at least this limitation. Pavo is silent as to having a first auxiliary conductor inductively coupled to a first primary conductor. Applicant also believes that this limitation is not inherent within the disclosure of Pavo, as Pavo does not discuss the relative dimension or geometry of the conductors and further fails to mention the spatial relationship between the conductors. Thus, Pavo does not teach all of the claimed limitations. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that for the above reasons claim 1 is patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

Claims 12 requires “establishing both conductance and transconductance between said first auxiliary conductor and a ground conductor.” Pavo does not disclose this limitation. Pavo is silent as to establishing both conductance and transconductance between said first auxiliary conductor and a ground conductor. Applicant also believes that this limitation is not inherent within the disclosure of Pavo, as Pavo does not discuss the relative dimension or geometry of the conductors and ground and further fails to mention the spatial relationship between the conductors and ground. Thus, Pavo does not teach all of the claimed limitations. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that for the above reasons claim 12 is patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

Claims 13 and 19 depend from claim 12, and thus inherit all limitations of claim 12. Each of claims 13 and 19 set forth features and limitations not recited by Pavo. Thus, the Applicant respectfully asserts that for the above reasons claims 13 and 19 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

### **Conclusion**

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 2-3, 14-18, and 20 include allowable subject matter.

For all the reasons given above, the Applicant submits that the pending claims distinguish over the prior art of record under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that this application is in full condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under **Order No. 10030059-1** from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

"Express Mail" label no. EV 629197067 US

Date of Deposit: 06/17/2005

I hereby certify that this is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to: Director for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Typed Name: Phyllis Ewing

Signature: 

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael A. Papalas

Registration No.: 40,381

(214) 855-8186

Attorney for Applicant